



The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning™

2018

Volume 8/Issue 2

Article 9

Revising Orally: The Transformative Process from Text to Talk in the Writing Tutorial

Juhi Kim, Department of English, Miami University, Oxford, USA, juhikim.1@gmail.com

Recommended Citations:

APA

Kim, J. (2018). Revising orally: The transformative process from text to talk in the writing tutorial. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 8(2), 109-122.

MLA

Juhi Kim. "Revising Orally: The Transformative Process from Text to Talk in the Writing Tutorial." *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning* 8.2 (2018): 109-122.

The JLTL is freely available online at www.jltl.org, with neither subscription nor membership required.

Contributors are invited to review the Submission page and manuscript templates at www.jltl.org/Submitonline

As an online journal, the JLTL adopts a green-policy journal. Please print out and copy responsibly.





The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 2018(2), pp. 109-122

Revising Orally: The Transformative Process from Text to Talk in the Writing Tutorial

Juhi Kim¹

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received October 28, 2017

Revisions completed May 20, 2018

Published June 30, 2018

Key Words:

Writing Center

Writing Tutorial

L2 Writers

Revising

Collaboration

ABSTRACT

'Writing as a collaborative process' is the major philosophy of writing instruction in the contemporary university writing center. The view of writing as a process, not as a product, puts the emphasis of instruction on the process of writing instead of the product of writing, which focuses on the 'talk' of the instruction, not the text. In this light, the writing tutorial in the writing center is a conversational procedure for the work of writing, and the instruction for writing is enacted through the talk and transferred to the future revision. This study examines how an L2 writer interacts with an L1 tutor during the writing tutorial and how the shift of the focus of writing instruction from the text to talk is played out in their actual tutorial. Through the analysis of their talk-in-interaction for the work of the tutorial, this study will investigate how the L1 tutor and L2 tutee revise a paper 'orally' through talk and what it means to instruct writing by talk, not by text, for the work of the tutorial in the frame of the process-oriented philosophy of writing instruction.

© Association of Applied Linguistics. All rights reserved

Along with the shift of the concept of literacy education, the idea of 'writing as a process' has been settled well in past decades in the US. Writing instruction is designed and pursued to emphasize the process of writing as planning, developing, drafting and revising, not the product of the writing. These multiple stages of writing enable the multiple drafts of the writing during the writing process. What happens in and between the multiple stages of the writing process in terms of how the writer interacts with the feedback they received on the draft, how the writer makes a decision for their revision, the variants and elements involved in the work of the process of writing have been an interest to many educators, scholars and administrators.

The instructional philosophy of the writing center also has shifted from the traditional style that focuses on remedial error correction to the contemporary style that emphasizes the collaborative process of the writing instruction. Instead of providing a first aid, fix-it-service (Walvoord, 1981; Hairston, 1982; Hayward, 1983; North, 1984), the work of the writing center has been reshaped as an academic research

¹ Miami University, Oxford, USA, juhikim.1@gmail.com

center for teaching and learning as an independent organization. This change of the instructional philosophy has been represented as conversation-based instruction during the writing tutorial that focuses on the change of the writers, not on the text. Process-focused, student-centered writing instruction has become the major instructional philosophy of the contemporary writing centers.

Although the writing center was initially established to help native English speakers with their academic writing ability, the majority population of the writing center nowadays is international students. For those who come from different languages, cultures and educational backgrounds, English proficiency is critical for their academic success. In their previous language experiences, English was an academic subject in which to achieve a high score, not a language for everyday communication. Particularly for those who come from an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) context, English has been studied to obtain a high score on the standardized English test (TOEFL) to receive an admission from the college. Their training in English is mostly focused on the teacher-centered, lecture-based preparation for the English examination. Thus, their reading skills are relatively higher than their other language skills; however, their experiences of speaking and writing in English in an academic context are very limited (Dvorak, 2016; Linville, 2009, Reid, 1998).

In this context, the writing center on campus is quite an attractive place for them to receive help in writing and to improve their English proficiency in terms of many aspects. However, it is an attractive place only until they learn and figure out the differences in their instructional styles and that which the writing center provides. For those novice writers who come from different languages, cultures and educational backgrounds, the conversation based writing instruction that requires various stages of writing process and multiple drafts for a single paper is not just challenging but could be overwhelming. The unfamiliarity that the tutees encounter during the tutorial in terms of the language, culture and the different instructional style becomes the burden to the tutor for the work of the writing tutorial.

In this regard, this study will investigate how the first time visiting L2 writer works and interacts with the L1 tutor during the tutorial in the process of revising the paper through questions and answers. I will first provide a transcript of the tutorial then the detailed analysis of their talk and interactions with an interest on their turn-by-turn question and answer. By examining the detailed talk and interactions, I will show how the work of the writing instruction shifts from the text to the talk and from the talk to the text and how the speaking and writing practices are connected in the process of the writing instruction provided in the writing center.

2. Literature Review

2.1. *Learning as Social Interaction*

According to Vygotsky (1978), learning is a social process that occurs through interaction among the members of the community to accomplish the shared goals and purposes for the social, cultural and historical events. By having common goals and purposes, the novices learn how to perform the social activities to achieve the goals by interactively engaging with the experts in the community. The process of interaction through engagement with the experts for the common goal is a process to learn how to be a member of the community, which is the process of socialization as a complete member of the society. Learning is mediated by the individual's engagement and participatory interaction in the social practice, and the result of the social interaction in which learning occurred becomes the knowledge that is co-constructed by the members, not individually but jointly (Vygotsky, 1978).

Vygotsky (1978) defined the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) as the "distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more

capable peers". He defined learning and development with more specific terms that include the learner's current status and the potential targeted status in their knowledge development. With the guided help of an adult or more competent peers, the interactions between the expert and the novice, which is the interpersonal, interactive process, leads the change in the intrapersonal process of the individual for development (Vygotsky, 1978). In order to make the interaction effective for learning, it is important that the members keep the shared understanding of the task and goals (Rogoff, 1990) and engage in the activity collaboratively. The active engagement and collaboration for the shared activity is closely related to the participants' socio-cultural knowledge as well as their interpretation and perception of the aims of activities. Without the shared understanding of the activity, the negotiation of the participants' social and cultural knowledge with the contexts becomes difficult (Edwards & Potter, 1992). In this regard, language in interactions that are mediated by social and cultural practices becomes important to understand the guided construction of knowledge (Mercer, 1995) in the process of engaging in the social construction of knowledge and recreating the culture that promotes learning.

2.2. Transformative Process between Speaking and Writing

Halliday (1973) differentiated the functions of spoken language and written language as spoken language has an "interpersonal" function whereas written language has an "ideational" function. Both functions are similar in that they are concerned with communication; but, they are different in terms of their manifestation of form: speaking functions as a social action such as conversation, storytelling, verse and song, whereas writing functions as a repository of ideas such as statement, argument, and explanation. Speaking is immediate and spontaneous. It can be accompanied by paralinguistic elements such as gesture or intonation whereas writing is permanent and planned, which cannot be provided with any contextual support (Cambourne, 1981). The physical involvement in speaking also differs from writing as we can speak in standing, sitting, and running where speaking can serve as a guide to physical action. Speaking in this way is social and improvised while writing is solitary, controlled and learned. However, despite the differences between the two modes of communication, speaking and writing, they are inextricably linked as translations of each other in our everyday experiences (Barritt, 1981).

The two modalities have been employed by the classroom teacher to help the students to reduce the gap between speaking and writing, in other words, their oracy and literacy (Rubin and Kantor, 1984). To enhance their coding skills from speaking to writing, not just the "mechanic skills (articulation, enunciation, projection, spelling and punctuation)", but also the "organizational skills (discourse and knowledge of language pragmatics)", Rubin and Kantor recommended increasing facilities to help students' communicative competence that can develop their expressive language and connect their ideas to the written text. Also by raising social awareness, the students can develop a sense of writing for a specific audience and through oral communication where they can imagine the feedback from the potential readers, which will be helpful to refine their texts in transition from speaking to writing. The transition between speaking and writing from the interpersonal social process to the intrapersonal individual process concurs with Vygotsky (1978)'s theory of learning. Rubin and Cantor argued that speaking and writing are like "vehicles" for sharing knowledge where the students can transform their oral discourse into conversation with an internalized potential audience of readers. Writing becomes a tool for organizing thoughts for students. Speaking and writing in this regard have been employed by the classroom teacher as a way to help the students to reduce the gap from oracy to literacy, and to develop writing proficiency. The speaking-writing connections to enhance writing proficiency have been widely employed in class in the forms of peer review, journal writing, writing conferences and tutorials, etc. (Weissberg, 2008).

As was discussed, learning occurs as social interaction through guided participation between the experts and novices, and language mediated in social and cultural practices plays an important role to recreate cultures that promote learning through guided construction of knowledge. Language in the learning process is significant for the participant to develop as a socially and culturally competent member of the community. In this regard, the interactive discursive practices of social interaction for learning between interpersonal and intrapersonal, social and individual, speaking and writing, and oracy to literacy in the instructional environment in educational contexts become important for an individual to be socialized as a complete member of the community.

Therefore, in the next section, this study will examine how speaking and writing are interwoven with each other during the writing tutorial in the university writing center, particularly, how the L2 writer as a novice writer works with the L1 tutor who has expertise in writing during the tutorial to make connections between the speaking and writing practices in the process of revising the paper.

3. Methodology

3.1. Data Collection

The site for this study is the writing center at a major Midwestern university in the US and the excerpt introduced here was selected for a case study approached ethnographically. The purpose of a case study is to study the phenomena that occur naturally in everyday activity from the perspective of the participants (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003). William and Severino (2004) also stated the necessity of case study research of tutoring interactions and relationships to understand the nature of the second language writing practice. The case introduced in this study reveals the representative characteristics of the L2 writer who visits the university writing center for his first visit. The tutor selected in this study is a native English speaking graduate student who had been tutoring for three years at the time of conducting this study and the tutee is an undergraduate student from South Korea who made his first visit to the writing center. Their writing tutorial was videotaped with their agreement and with IRB permission.

As an analytic framework, Conversation Analysis (CA) was employed to examine the circumstantial details of talk and interactions during the tutorial with the focus on the learner's interactional competence to identify the nature of learning interaction. CA is the study of orderliness of naturally occurring talk-in-interaction (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984), which was developed from ethnomethodology in the 1960s and focuses on "the interactional organization of social activities" (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 2008, p.12), which is describing organizational structure such as turn-taking, adjacent pair, and repair practices (Goodwin, 1981; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). Turn-taking in natural conversation is locally managed and administered by the participants, and each next turn of the two different speakers in their talk-in-interactions is controlled interactionally by the context that was provided in the previous turn (Moreman and Sacks, 1988). CA examines a speaker's social actions that are accomplished through talk and shows the management of the goal and the purpose that the members pursue in their interactional context. Their talk-in-interactions are shaped by the knowledge based on the mutually shared understanding of the activity they are involved.

The videoed tutorial was transcribed following the convention of conversation analysis (Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson, 1974). By analyzing the fine-grained transcripts of the writing tutorial, this study provides the vivid descriptive details of the tutorial interaction between the L1 tutor and the L2 tutee that reveals the nature of the one-on-one tutorial instruction.

3.2. Data Analysis

The tutee, Hyun-Chul is an undergraduate student from South Korea. He brought his writing assignment from his English 110 class², which is the mandatory first year English course. Visiting the Writing Center is required for both native and nonnative English speaking students at least once to work with the tutor about their paper at any stage in their writing. This is his first visit to the Center. The tutor, Steve is a native English speaking graduate student who has been tutoring for three years and is knowledgeable about the ENG 110 assignment. Steve reads the paper and asks questions about the sentences that he does not understand. In order to understand the confusing parts of the text, Steve had to revise his questions several times to receive Hyun-Chul's explanation about the lines.

Transcript 1

82 ► T: I'm confused here so this sentence ((T reading the lines aloud))
83 There are number of reasons brought about this result (.h)
84 but the step for measure for following the reasons has to be (.h)
85 systematic and strong because inappropriate punishment
86 and unsystematic spiritual education can bring more serious (.h)
87 crimes by people with criminal record than- they did before
88 Um (1.0)
89 ► T: Can you explain this idea (.) to me a little bit about more fully?
90 C: =hm hm u-um (.) um
91 This is- This is about s-some e:h wha-what happen in-in south korea
92 T: Okay
93 C: And the:- nowadays in south korea eh there are (.1) a-a- number of-
94 a number of a crime (.) crime(.) agains um the- the younger- younger-
95 younger- student
96 T: Hm hm
97 C: And uh(.) uh such a- uh relatedly sexual offense (.)
98 T: Hm
99 C: A:nd uh: um two- two years ago eh some- some guys- a guy um
100 ha- ha-has some event- uh has some crime- crime uh again um-
101 eight years old um younger(.1) young(.) girl(.)
102 T: Hm hm
103 C: A:n after- after two years a:n da u:h there are a:n happen same- same sing
104 crime in South Korea (.)
105 T: Hm hm
106 C: But- but the: the punishment the- the degree of punishment is bery- bery
107 lower than the other countries
108 T: hm hm
109 C: and so- so nowadays this is very big issue in a South Korea
110 T: Sure(.) But in terms of this sentence (.)

² English 110 is the course that all freshmen are required to take, and visiting the writing center at least once during the course is mandatory for their course assignment. The tutors are informed of their visits in the beginning of the semester during the staff meeting. Since they are regular visiting clientele every semester, most tutors are quite familiar with the assignments that they bring to the Center. However, for those novice writers from English 110, the tutors usually begin the work of the tutorial by checking their course syllabus and the course assignment sheet first to make sure that the students have a full understanding of their assignment.

111 Right here ((clearing his throat)) Um(.2) So
112 ► Do you mean that there are number of reasons(.1) that crime is going up?
113 ► Or do you mean that there are (.) that the crime rate going up has(.)
114 ► ca:used a number of things (.2) because brought about this result (.)
115 First of all I don't know if you mean brought about by this result?
116 But (.) reasons aren't brought about by anything (.)
117 reasons cause something (.)
118 ► So it seems like(.)
119 This could mean one of the two things either you mean (.2)
120 there are number of reasons (.1)(h) that the crime rate is going up
121 ► C: Hm-hm ((nodding))
122 ► T: Is that what you mean?
123 C: *Okay*
124 ► T: =Eh- I mean(.)
125 ► Are you going to tell me the reasons why the crime rate is going up?
126 ► Or are you going to tell me the things that the crime rate is caused?
127 ► Which one?
128 C: A:n not eh-not-not separate a:n da put- put this sentence in the: the-
129 this sentence and there are number of reasons eh the- the rate is going up
130 T: Okay(.1) A(h)l-right
131 ► So you can just say that the rate is going up
132 If you didn't wanna repeat (3.0)
133 If you didn't wanna repeat that there would be other ways to say it
134 you could certainly say there are number of reasons for this increase (.2)

Steve, in line 82, finds a sentence to work with, which is not clear to understand. He reads out the sentences in lines 83-87, "There are number of reasons brought about this result (.h) but the step for measure for following the reasons has to be (.h) systematic and strong because inappropriate punishment and unsystematic spiritual education can bring more serious (.h)" and asks Hyun-Chul to explain the sentences in line 89, "Can you explain this idea (.) to me a little bit about more fully?"

Hyun-Chul begins his answer in line 90 and continues until line 109. He talks about "what happened in South Korea (line 91), which is about a "crime against a younger student (lines 93-95)" that is a "sexual offense (line 97)" committed by "some guys against eight years old young girl (lines 99-101)". After two years, the "same crime happened (lines 103-104)", "but the degree of punishment is very lower than the other countries (lines 106-107)". So it is a "big issue in South Korea (line 109)". He talks about the sexual offense committed against an eight-year old girl in South Korea. Steve gives him continuers in lines 92, 96, 98, 102, 105 and 108. Steve's question in line 89 was about the sentences he read out. Hyun-Chul's answers were about the topic - sexual offense- of his paper and the social background about a topic that had been an issue in South Korea, not specifically about the sentences that the tutor read. Steve sees that and clarifies his question by pointing out the sentences he read in lines 110-111.

Steve in line 110 marks a receipt of what Hyun-Chul answered, then points to the problematic sentence and asks a question one more time. In line 89, Steve had already asked Hyun-Chul an open question, "Can you explain...?" At this time, he elaborates his question more and asks Hyun-Chul an optional question, "Do you mean this... or do you mean this...?" in lines 112-114. Before completing the question, Steve reads the phrase "brought about this result" (line 114) from the problematic lines and asks another question about the phrase. He adds "by" in the phrase and asks him if "brought about by this result" is what he meant. However, without giving Hyun-Chul a turn to answer, Steve continues talking

about his confusion until line 117. Then he offers his guess as to what Hyun-Chul might mean by giving an option for him to choose from, “this could mean one of the two things either you mean...” in lines 118–120.

By providing so much elaboration of his question, Steve is attempting to make his question easy for Hyun-Chul to follow, as he recognizes the problems Hyun-Chul is having. Hyun-Chul shows his agreement in line 121 by nodding his head. Steve seeks confirmation of his understanding in line 122, “Is that what you mean?” Hyun-Chul answers “Okay” in a soft voice.

What is important to note here is that “Okay” is not the expected, or correct, answer to the question, “Is that what you mean?” It should be either “Yes” or “No”. Steve latches onto this struggle with language proficiency in line 124 and revises his question with more elaboration. Steve provides two full statements so that Hyun-Chul can choose an answer in lines 125–126 and asks him to choose one in line 127. Hyun-Chul seems not to understand fully Steve’s question. For the two sentences that were provided as options to choose, Hyun-Chul answers, “not separate and put this sentence in this sentence”, then says “number of reasons eh the-the rate is going up (line 129)”. Thus, progress during the tutorial is stalled by Hyun-Chul’s difficulties with English language proficiency.

Despite it seeming as if Hyun-Chul does not understand what Steve asked him, Hyun-Chul made his answer clear by repeating what Steve said in line 125. Steve accepts it with confirmation in line 130 and gives Hyun-Chul an alternate expression, “the rate is going up” (line 131) and “there are a number of reasons for this increase” (line 134). So, finally, in this way, the first sentence (line 83) from the problematic lines, “There are number of reasons brought about this result” was revised as “There are a number of reasons for this increase”.

83 *There are number of reasons brought about this result*
→ There are number of reasons ~~brought about this result~~ **for this increase**

Figure 1. Sentence in line 83 revised orally through conversation

Steve initially asks the opening question (line 89), “Can you explain this idea...” then he revised his question as an optional questions, “Do you mean that... or do you mean that...” along with an elaboration of the possible meanings (lines 112–120). The answers that Hyun-Chul provided were not fully clear for the meaning of the sentence so the tutor asked another clarifying questions in lines 125–127. The questions become more direct, “Are you going to tell me...? Or are you going to tell me...? Which one?” In order to clarify one sentence to be understandable, many revisions of the initial question were offered. They now move on the next line of the sentences that they have not finished.

Transcript 2

135 T: Um but the step for measure following (.2)(h) the reasons
136 That’s- I don’t understand that either(.)
137 ► Do you mean(.2) the response to this increase?
138 C: Yes
139 T: But the step for measure following this increase in this way-
140 Ok so there are number of reasons the rate is going up
141 the step for measure following this increase (.1)
142 has to be systematic and strong (.)
143 because inappropriate punishment
144 (4.5)

145 than they did before
146 ► Uh- then do u mean that if it's (.) no:t(.2) severe(.2) enough(.5)
147 ► then (3.0) people will be repeat offenders?
148 C: (2.7)
149 ► T: Is that what you mean?
150 C: Hm (2.5) ((reading the paper))
151 T: Bring more serious crimes by people with the criminal record(.1)
152 People with the criminal record committing crimes(.)
153 That sounds to me like repeat offenders like people (.1) um
154 who have gotten through some kind of treatment program
155 or punishment committing another sexual offence
156 ► Is that (.) what you mean to say?
157 C: = Yes
158 T: = Ok(.1) So(.3) Um(.2)(.h)
159 By inappropriate the- you- wha:t makes an inappropriate punishment?
160 ► Is it that(.) it's not severe enough?
161 C: H::m
162 T: Or that it's-
163 C: =H:m um the- the degree of punishment is bery lower(.2)
164 lower than maybe por example um some(.) so- s- um- some- some
165 criminal in south korea get- um- usually ge:t maybe two years or to five
166 years jus- uh bery lower uh punishment in- u:m uh-comparing the
167 T: =Right
168 C: =the United States
169 ► T: Okay(.) So (.2)
170 Let's say insufficient punishment (.2)
171 Um(.5) in unsystematic spiritual education
172 now(.) you recommending a systematic spiritual(.2) education in(.) prison
173 Okay(.) Um (5.5)
174 I- I would say(.2) rather than this (.)
175 I would- I would say I would suggest ()
176 unsystematic spiritual education can lead (.2) to (.)
177 Um (6.5) ((T, Writing on the paper))
178 an increase (.4) in serious crime(.2) serious crimes //by people with a
179 C: // ((C, nodding))
180 T: criminal record(.2) and you don't need this
181 So it's it- it- and- and whether or not that's repeat often-
182 I mean- it is repeat offenders but you don't need to use that language (.2)
183 I think u can use the language that you've got

Steve reads again the sentence, “but the step for measure for following the reasons”(line 84) that he does not understand (line 135) and this time asks a *yes/no question* about what the tutee might have meant, which includes his guess as to what Hyun-Chul means, “this increase” (line 137). With Hyun-Chul’s agreement, Steve re-reads the sentence with the addition of “this increase” in line 139, “But the step for measure following this increase”. After “following”, Steve removed “the reasons” from Hyun-Chul’s original sentence and adds “this increase” instead. Then Steve re-reads the sentence aloud to see if it makes sense in lines 140-143. What we see here is that Steve is trying to compensate for Hyun-Chul’s

language difficulties in an effort to get the interaction back on a productive track in order to make sense of understanding of the sentence.

A four and a half second pause follows. Steve finishes reading the sentence in line 145. He asks another question in lines 146-147. He seeks to understand the Hyun-Chul's clunky sentence, and he needs Hyun-Chul's clarification about it in order to proceed. A two and a half second pause follows. Hyun-Chul does not give him an answer. Steve asks one more time, "Is that what you mean" in line 149. Hyun-Chul does not answer and instead reads his paper. It is not clear whether Hyun-Chul does not understand Steve's question or if he is not sure of what he meant in his sentence. Since Hyun-Chul does not answer the question, Steve provides more elaboration of his question and offers his guess as the meaning that Hyun-Chul might have intended (lines 153-155). In other words, Steve repeatedly does the work that Hyun-Chul needs to do for the tutorial – explaining what he meant and then helps Hyun-Chul to answer what he meant (line 156)—as a result of Hyun-Chul's problems with English language proficiency. Steve asks him if it is what he meant. Hyun-Chul agrees with the tutor.

Another question from Steve about "inappropriate punishment" follows in lines 159-160. Instead of answering the question, Hyun-Chul marks a receipt in line 161. Steve tries to offer more elaboration, but Hyun-Chul interrupts him and explains that the "degree of punishment is very lower... two years or to five years compared to the United States" (lines 163-166, 168). Steve accepts the answer (line 167, 169) and gives him an alternate expression, "insufficient punishment," for the phrase "inappropriate punishment" in line 171. Then he reads out loud the next phrase, "unsystematic spiritual education (line 171)". Instead of investigating more about the phrase, "unsystematic spiritual education", Steve provides his suggestion for revision for the rest of the sentences following (lines 174-178). For Hyun-Chul's original sentence in lines 86-87, "unsystematic spiritual education can bring more serious crimes by people with criminal record than they did before", Steve provides an alternate expression in lines 176-178, "Unsystematic spiritual education can lead (.2) to (.) an increase (.4) in serious crime(.2) serious crimes by people with a criminal record (.2)" and removes the rest, "than they did before (line 180)". Hyun-Chul nods at Steve's oral revision in line 179. Finally, Hyun-Chul's original sentences (lines 83-87) are revised to an understandable or acceptable level. In an effort to overcome the student's language-related issues and achieve the goals of the tutorial, Steve assumes more responsibility for improving the writing.

Steve also tells Hyun-Chul to use the phrase "people with a criminal record" instead of "repeat offenders". In order to make the one sentence understandable, Steve had to work heavily through several sequences and revised the sentence orally in an understandable manner. However, using the technical term "repeat offenders" is just a matter of word choice. Although "repeat offenders" sounds natural in the context, Hyun-Chul's phrase, "people with a criminal record" is understandable as well. Thus, instead of offering the term "repeat offenders", which was not produced from their work with the student, Steve recommends Hyun-Chul to use his own phrase. Steve does not merely work to make Hyun-Chul's paper better. He works for Hyun-Chul to be involved with the work for his paper. In this way, the tutor follows the Center's no proofreading policy.

84 but the step for measure for following the reasons has to be
85 systematic and strong because inappropriate punishment
86 and unsystematic spiritual education can bring more serious
87 crimes by people with criminal record than they did before



but the step for measure for following the reasons this increase has to be
systematic and strong because inappropriate insufficient punishment
and unsystematic spiritual education can bring more lead to an increase in serious

crimes by people with a criminal record than they did before.

Figure 2. Sentences in lines 84-87 revised orally through conversation

In this way, the clunky sentences that the tutor read were revised through questions and answers. The tutor's initial question was to figure out what the tutee meant; however, when the tutee began struggling in explaining due to the language proficiency, the tutor began providing the potential answers to his own questions, which were to figure out what the tutee might have meant. The talk between the tutor and the tutee, the questions and answers about the sentence that are interactively exchanged and developed is actually the resources for revision for the sentences. In this excerpt, the answers from the L2 tutee were not really supportive to clarify the meaning of the sentences that the tutor was confused. So the tutor had to provide the possible answers for the tutee about the meaning of the sentences to his own question. When there is no engagement from the tutee as an input to clarify the meaning of the sentences, the burden to move on to the next of the work of the tutorial goes to the tutor. The tutor asks a question to move on and provides the answer to his/her own question as well. Both the initiation (question) and the engagement (reply) were mostly made by the tutor. In this way, the revision of the sentences was completed orally through the talk during the tutorial based on the questions and the answers about the meaning of the sentences.

83 *There are number of reasons brought about this result*
84 *but the step for measure for following the reasons has to be*
85 *systematic and strong because inappropriate punishment*
86 *and unsystematic spiritual education can bring more serious*
87 *crimes by people with criminal record than they did before.◎*



There are number of reasons **for this increase**
but the step for measure following **this increase** has to be
systematic and strong because **insufficient** punishment
and unsystematic spiritual education can **lead to an increase in** serious
crimes by people with **a** criminal record.

Figure 3. Sentences revised orally through conversation

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. *Revising 'Orally' through Questions and Answers*

The traditional writing center corrected the text in writing but the contemporary writing center corrects the talk for writing, not the text. More specifically, the contemporary writing center corrects the text by talk. They don't correct the tutee's paper to instruct them how to write, i.e., they don't proofread. They correct the text by instructional conversation. The writing tutorial is a process of making sense of the text for both the tutor and the tutee. The tutor asks a question orally in order to understand the text; therefore, the tutor's question is to begin the work of 'revising' the problematic sentences. The tutee's

answers to the tutor's questions about the text and their conversation through instruction become the resource for the revision process.

The tutor in the excerpts asked questions with several repeated elaborations by using various types of questions from the *wh-question* to the *yes/no question* such as: direct questioning (Can you explain...?), rephrasing (Do you mean this...?), and reformulating (Is this what you meant...?). By doing so, the tutor himself provided many potential answers to his own questions, which were supposed to be provided by the tutee. Due to the lack of answers from the tutee that could clarify what the tutee initially had meant in the sentences, the tutor had to ask many revised questions that may include the possible meanings of the text. By those optional questions, the tutor provided many resources for revision; however, without much meaningful engagement from the tutee, the tutor had to revise his questions by answering his own questions. The talks and interactions during the tutorial that happen in this way become easily the tutor's own one-way communication based on his *guess* about what the L2 writer might have intended in the sentences. Lack of input from the tutee in this way becomes not just the tutee's struggle but also the tutor's burden to work with the absence of an interactive conversant.

The writing tutorial is like an instructive conversation conducted through turn-by-turn, oral/aural interaction between the tutor and the tutee, more specifically, the continuous string of questions and answers clarify the meaning of the problematic sentences and make them understandable. The practice of questioning and answering between the tutor and the tutee during the tutorial is to practice conversing with the potential readers and the writer, which will make the writing better in the end through the revising process. Thus the quality of their interaction for writing instruction during the tutorial completely relies on their oral communication. If L2 writers are not good with oral/aural communication skills, it becomes very difficult to have a positive experience from the instruction that the writing center provides, which is why L2 writers struggle in the writing instruction during the tutorials.

4.2. The Transformative Process through the Interactive Engagement

The reciprocal transformation from the text and the talk between the tutor and the tutee through turn-by-turn engagement is inevitable for the collaborative process of the work of the tutorial to succeed. Development of the text for revision occurs through the interactive engagement between the tutor and the tutee, and the talk and the text.

The tutee's reply provides the tutor with the actual understanding about the problem they are working. With that, the tutor can estimate the potential level of improvement that the tutee can reach in solving the problem they are working (Vygotsky, 1978; Fisher, 1993; Webb, Troper & Fall, 1995; Mercer, 1996). The tutee's engagement with the problem in the writing mediates the gap from the clunky, complex and ambiguous text to the talk that can clarify through elaboration. The talk mediates the text and fills the void of miscommunication between the tutor and the tutee about the text. The transformative process between the tutor and the tutee about the text through talk is mandatory for a successful experience for the work of the tutorial. In this regard, an L2 tutee's lack of language proficiency with or without engagement during the tutorial easily hinders the instruction that requires the interactive engagement.

Therefore, the tutor constantly puts his effort into having the tutees engage in the work of the tutorial. If the tutee resists engaging in the work of the tutorial or cannot provide any meaningful reply for the problem solving interaction, the burden to make the work of the tutorial falls on the tutor. Therefore, the interactive process for instruction by both the tutor and the tutee cannot be performed properly.

5. Conclusion

According to North (1984), the pioneering scholar of the philosophy of the writing center, “the writing center produces better writers, not better writing”, which means, the focus of the instruction is not the text, but the writers who can talk about their writings. They prefer working with the writers about their writings, not directly with their writings because their instruction is designed to work by talk, not by the text.

Better writers’ ultimate goal is to produce *better writing* and what L2 writers want is, without doubt, to produce better writing and become better writers as well. In this way, producing better writing is the ultimate goal for both the writers and the tutors through the instruction of the writing center. In order to produce *better writing*, however, they have to become a better speaker first, who knows how to work with the tutor about their paper through the collaborative process of conversational negotiation, which is a challenging requirement for many of the less skilled L2 writers who seek for help from the writing center. Here is where irony exists.

The writing center’s philosophy about producing better writers works only when the tutee knows how to converse effectively and collaboratively with the tutor about their writing, which is difficult for many L2 writers who are still in a transitional phase to adjust themselves to the new language and culture. This means, those who need the most help for their writing may not get enough help from the writing center (Moussu, 2013). Ironically, the pedagogy of the contemporary writing center causes those who are in need of the most help for their writing to receive the least help to improve their writing.

In order for a successful interactive process of the tutorial with the L2 writers, they need *time* and *practice* to work with the tutor effectively to improve their writing (Kim, 2014). This is why they need a positive experience in their first visit to the writing center. As they work with the tutor continuously, their knowledge about how to work with the tutor and how to talk about their writing will improve. Through the interactive and collaborative process of speaking and writing from talk to text during tutorials, L2 writers will transform into better writers who can produce better writing.

6. Suggestions and Implications

Most L2 writers take an English writing course once they register for college in the US. Oftentimes, it becomes their first experience of English writing that is not aiming for a standardized English test, but instead focuses on the process itself of their writing for an academic purpose through multiple stages of drafts. One-on-one conferences with the instructor, and the tutor in the writing center for additional support are all new experiences in their writing practices. This means that the L2 writers’ expectations about the writing process and the instructional practice can be very different from the tutors’ in the writing center. In addition to the issue of language proficiency, the new instructional practice that the L2 writers never experienced can be overwhelming for them, and their lack of experience and knowledge about the work of the writing tutorial can be challenging for the tutor to work with, as it was shown. Therefore, instructing the process of the writing tutorial to the L2 writers, particularly the first-time visitors, is significant for them to understand the conversation-based instruction of the writing tutorial. Introducing the work of the writing center during orientation by showing a video of the tutorials, comments and feedback from the returning tutees will be helpful for them to have a sense of the work of the writing tutorial.

References

Atkinson, J.M. & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barritt, L. (1981). Writing/speaking: A descriptive phenomenological view. In Kroll, B.M. and Vann, R.J. (Eds), *Exploring speaking-writing relationships: Connections and contrasts* (pp.124-133). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Cambourne, B. (1981). Oral and written relationships: a reading perspective. In Kroll, B.M. and Vann, R.J. (Eds), *Exploring speaking-writing relationships: Connections and contrasts* (pp.82-98). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Dvorak, K. (2016). Multilingual writers, multilingual tutors: Code-switching/mixing/meshing in the writing center. In S. Bruce and B. Rafoth (eds.), *Tutoring second language writers* (pp.101-122). Colorado: Utah State University Press.

Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fisher, E. (1993). Distinctive features of pupil - pupil classroom talk and their relationship to learning. How discursive exploration might be encouraged. *Language and Education*, 7(4), 239 - 257.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J.P. & Borg, W.R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th edition). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Kim, J. (2014). Better writers or better writing? A qualitative study of second language writers' experiences in a university writing center. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Linville, C. (2009). Editing line by line. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (eds.), *ESL writers a guide for writing center tutors* (2nd edition) (p.116-131), NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: Talk among teachers and learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mercer, N. (1996). The quality of talk in children's collaborative activity in the classroom. *Learning and Instruction*, 6, 359 - 377.

Moreman, M. & Sacks, H. (1988). On understanding in the analysis of natural conversation, In *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis* (180 - 86). Moreman, M. (ed). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvanian Press.

Moussu, L. (2013). Let's talk! ESL students' needs and writing centre philosophy. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30(2), 55-68.

North, S. (1984). The idea of a Writing Center. *College English*, 46(5). 433-446.

Reid, J. (1998). "Eye" learners and "ear" learners: Identifying the language needs of international student and U.S. resident writers. In Byrd, P. & Reid, J.M.(Eds.), *Grammar in the Composition Classroom: Essays on Teaching ESL for College-Bound Students* (pp.3-17). New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: cognitive development in socially shared cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rubin, D. & Kantor, K. (1984). Talking and writing: Building communicative competence. In C. Thaiss & C. Suhor (Eds.), *Speaking and writing, K-12* (pp. 29-73). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696-735.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Webb, N. M., Troper, J.D., & Fall, R. (1995). Constructive activity and learning in collaborative small groups. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(3), 406 - 423.

Weissberg, R. (2008). Critiquing the Vygotskian approach to L2 literacy. In Belcher, D. and Hirvela, A. (Eds), *The oral-literate connection* (pp.26-45). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Williams, J., & Severino, C. (2004). The writing center and second language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(3), 165-172.

Appendix A

Transcript Notations

(.) micro pause
(2.0) Timed silence within or between adjacent utterances
// Notes the point at which one speaker overlaps another.
= Notes the ending of one utterance and the beginning of a next without gap or overlap.
_ Underlining indicates stress
(.h) Indicates an in-breath
(h) Indicates out breath
- Hyphens indicate a word cut off in its production
* * Notes soft speaking
: A colon indicates a sound stretch on a word or word portion
() Empty indicates an unheard utterance
[Left bracket indicates a simultaneous start by two speakers
] Right bracket indicates two utterances ending simultaneously